



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/675,677	09/29/2000	Leo J. Campbell	8049.0001	1495

22852 7590 04/21/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2134

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/675,677

Applicant(s)

CAMPBELL ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher J. Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-31 and 42-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-31 and 42-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

#### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 8 is dependent on cancelled claim 7.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 26, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.**

**103(a) as being unpatentable over Byrd US 6,081,899 in view of Rubin US 5,638,446 in view of Lloyd US 6,691,231.**

As per claim 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, and 26 Byrd discloses a method for authenticating and electronic message (Col 2 lines 6-7). Byrd discloses a client (user) creating a message, (Col 4 lines 32-34) and sends the message to be authenticated by a server appending a timestamp and digital signature (Col 2 lines 25-27, Col 4 lines 16-22). Byrd discloses the message is forwarded to the recipient, (Col 4 lines 40-45). Byrd discloses that the recipient authenticates the stamp and signature, (Col 2 lines 30-33, Col 4 lines 45-50).

Art Unit: 2134

Byrd does not teach creating a digest. Byrd does not teach a log.

Lloyd teaches a log containing a record of a message exchange including digital signatures, timestamps, and other authentication data, (Col 7 lines 16-28).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add the log of Lloyd to the message system Byrd because the log provides for accountability and tracking when needed.

Rubin discloses a user creating a digest (hashing) and sending an electronic file to a third party for authentication. Rubin discloses that the third party digitally signs the hash in the creation of a certificate, (Col 3 lines 15-23).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add the method of hashing from Rubin with the Third party timestamp, signature, and log of the Byrd-Lloyd combination because the one-way hash allows the third party and recipient to check for tampering.

As per claim 3, Byrd discloses the timestamp indicates when the message was received, (Col 4 line 18).

As per claim 5, Byrd teaches that the message may be email, (Col 4 line 33). It is inherent in email that the electronic address included is that of the sender.

As per claim 6, Byrd discloses attaching at least one legal protection of an official entity (Verisign), (Col 3 lines 16-25).

As per claim 9, Byrd discloses authenticating the digital signature and authentication data, (Col 2 lines 30-35).

As per claims 17 and 21 Byrd discloses the use of the Internet (Col 4 line 6) it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to use TCP/IP.

**Claims 13, 14, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byrd US 6,081,899 in view of Rubin US 5,638,446 in view of Lloyd US 6,691,231 on view of X.509**

As per claims 13, 14, 23, and 24 the Byrd-Lloyd-Rubin combination does not explicitly teach including a digital key with a digital signature and using that key to authenticate the digital signature.

Byrd discloses that the message is sent with a certificate, (Col 4 line 2).

X.509 discloses that the X.509 certificate standard is widely accepted and that the certificate contains the subject's public key.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to use the X.509 standard because it is widely used, secure and flexible.

**Claims 27-31, and 42-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byrd US 6,081,899 in view of Rubin US 5,638,446 in view of Lloyd US 6,691,231 in view of Murray US 6,321,333**

As per claims 27-31, 42-45 Byrd discloses a method for authenticating and electronic message (Col 2 lines 6-7). Byrd discloses a client (user) creating a message, (Col 4 lines 32-34) and sends the message to be authenticated by a server appending a timestamp and digital signature (Col 2 lines 25-27, Col 4 lines 16-22). Byrd discloses the message is

forwarded to the recipient, (Col 4 lines 40-45). Byrd discloses that the recipient authenticates the stamp and signature, (Col 2 lines 30-33, Col 4 lines 45-50).

Byrd does not disclose creating a digest. Byrd does not disclose exporting a public key for authorizing.

Lloyd teaches a log containing a record of a message exchange including digital signatures, timestamps, and other authentication data, (Col 7 lines 16-28).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add the log of Lloyd to the message system Byrd because the log provides for accountability and tracking when needed.

Rubin discloses a user creating a digest (hashing) and sending an electronic message to a third party for authentication. Rubin discloses that the third party digitally signs the hash in the creation of a certificate, (Col 3 lines 15-23).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to add the method of hashing from Rubin with the Third party timestamp and signature of Byrd creating an electronic postmark because the one-way hash allows the third party and recipient to check for tampering.

Murray discloses getting a digital public key authorized by a certificate authority, (Col 4 lines 1-9).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Byrd Rubin combination with the authorized public key of Murray because the certificate authority is a mutually trusted entity so that the recipient of the key knows the key is trustworthy.

*Conclusion*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,148,342 teaches a log being hashed for security reasons.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J. Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

A stylized, handwritten signature in black ink, likely belonging to Christopher J. Brown. The signature is composed of large, fluid loops and strokes.

4/14/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, likely belonging to Andrew Caldwell. The signature is written in a cursive style with a clear, legible name.

**ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**